

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

21 February 1991

AM 10:00 CONVENE, 441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes:

17 January 1991

B. Dates of next meetings:

18 April 1991

16 May 1991

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 21/Feb/91-1, International Cultural and Trade Center, Federal Triangle development site, 14th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Schematic design. (Previous: CFA 15/Nov/89-1.)

B. U.S. Navy Memorial Foundation

1. CFA 21/Feb/91-2, Bas-reliefs for Navy Memorial, Pennsylvania Avenue at 8th Street, N.W. (Last submission of ongoing review: CFA 13/Dec/90-8.)

2. CFA 21/Feb/91-3, Inscriptions on bas-reliefs for Navy Memorial, Pennsylvania Avenue at 8th Street, N.W.

C. Department of the Treasury, U.S. Mint

CFA 21/Feb/91-4, Laurance S. Rockefeller medal. Designs.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS continued, 21 February 1991

D. John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

CFA 21/Feb/91-5, New Hampshire Avenue at Rock Creek Parkway. Modifications to gift shop and coatroom in the Hall of States.

E. Government of the District of Columbia,
Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

- a. S.L. 91-59, 6200 Oregon Avenue, N.W.
Addition of new facilities, Army Distaff Foundation. Concept design.
- b. S.L. 91-66, 22nd and N Streets, N.W.
New residential building.
Revised concept. (Previous:
S.L. 89-236, S.L. 89-188.)
- c. S.L. 91-68, 2140 N Street, N.W.,
Potomac Electric Power Company.
Alterations to facade on N Street.
Permit.
- d. Appendix I.

2. Old Georgetown Act

- a. Appendix II.

F. American Battle Monuments Commission

CFA 21/Feb/91-6, Korean War Veterans Memorial, between the Reflecting Pool and Independence Avenue, S.W., Ash Woods near Lincoln Memorial. Revised concept design. (Previous: CFA 17/Jan/91-2, CFA 13/Dec/90-1, CFA 26/Jul/89-1.)

G. Executive Office of the President

CFA 21/Feb/91-7, American Battle Monuments Commission Draft Bill "To amend the Act entitled, 'An Act to authorize the erection of a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor members of the Armed Forces of the United States who served in the Korean War.'"

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
S.L. 91-46	800 16th Street, N.W. Hay Adams Hotel Ltd. Part. The Grill	Canopy - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed canopy with modifications indicated on attached sketch received and dated 15 February 1991.

S.L. 91-47	2329 Porter Street, N.W.	Addition and
HPA. 91-176	Dr. Jonathan H. Pincus Residence	alteration to 2nd floor and roof - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed addition and alteration to 2nd floor and roof.

S.L. 91-53	1841 Ingleside Terrace, N.W. Marek Scott McCallum Residence	Alterations to rear - permit
------------	---	---------------------------------

ACTION: No objection to alterations to rear of house including enclosure of ground floor porch. Recommend against aluminum siding for rear upper stories. Recommend use of stucco to keep facade uniform.

S.L. 91-54	601 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.	Banner, & signs
HPA. 91-201	Bice Restaurant	on awnings and windows - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new logo on existing awnings and windows and for proposed banner.

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
S.L. 91-62 and S.L. 91-63	1453 Whittier Place, N.W. Marion Mann Residence	New walkway - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new concrete walkway to match existing.

S.L. 91-55	5101 16th Street, N.W. Christ Lutheran Church	Internally illuminated sign - permit
------------	--	--

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed internally illuminated sign.

S.L. 91-60	1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Quadrangle Corporation Colorfax 1 Hour Photo	Signs - permit
------------	---	-------------------

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed signs with back-lighted letters provided other existing illuminated signs are removed.

S.L. 91-64 HPA. 91-220	809 15th Street, N.W. Southern Building Associates	Sidewalk cafe - permit
---------------------------	---	---------------------------

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed open sidewalk cafe. Recommend against use of mid-sidewalk planters to define cafe border. Recommend use of movable poles or posts with boundary ropes. Request storefront comply with previously approved Action recommending that material of doors match existing storefronts. See previous Action (S.L. 90-149).

S.L. 91-65 HPA. 91-222	809 15th Street, N.W. Southern Building Associates	Planters - permit
---------------------------	---	----------------------

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for 3'-0" x 3'-0" planters (option A) placed against the wall of building to be used for small trees. Request storefront comply with previously approved Action recommending that material of doors match existing storefronts. See previous Action (S.L. 90-149).

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
S.L. 91-67	2475 Virginia Avenue, N.W. Potomac Plaza Apartments Cooperative, Inc.	Replacement of windows - permit
ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed replacement of windows.		
S.L. 90-57 HPA. 90-239	2225 N Street, N.W. IBG Development Apartment building	New windows and alterations - conceptual
ACTION: Returned without Action. Case superseded by case no. S.L. 91-66.		
S.L. 91-61	1100 Maine Avenue, S.W. Municipal Fish Wharf	Signs - permit
ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for oversized wood signs requiring special waiver. Circumstances surrounding project are together unusual. Site is federal property, outside RLA boundary, but leased by private merchants operating an industry unique to this site in Washington. The signs are intended as a cooperative venture and designed to be visible within the confines imposed by the 14th Street bridge crossing on the west and the 10th Street Mall overlook on the north. To comply more firmly with the requirements of the site, the applicant has agreed to alter proposed lighting and materials as indicated on the permit application, drawings, and attached letter.		
S.L. 91-49	2650 Virginia Avenue, N.W. Watergate Hotel Partners L. P.	Driveway canopy - permit
ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed canopy over driveway to entrance to hotel as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 15 February 1991.		

REVISED ACTIONS

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
S.L. 91-64	809 15th Street, N.W.	Sidewalk cafe
HPA. 91-220	Southern Building Associates	- permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed open sidewalk cafe which is delineated by stanchions and boundary ropes. Applicant has proposed an alternate storefront design which is more compatible with building. See supplemental drawings received and dated 3 April 1991.

S.L. 91-65	809 15th Street, N.W.	Planters
HPA. 91-222	Southern Building Associates	- permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed 25" x 25" planters (option A) placed against the wall of building to be used for small trees. Applicant has proposed an alternate storefront design which is more compatible with building. See supplemental drawings received and dated 3 April 1991.

OLD GEORGETOWN SUBMISSIONS

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
O.G. 90-188	3411 K Street, N.W. Walter Lynch Office	Alterations and addition - revised concept

ACTION: No objection to revised concept design as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 5 February 1991. Recommend resolution of permanent parking facility prior to submission for permit review.

O.G. 91-32	1003 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.	Alterations
HPA. 91-188	Door Store Inc.	- conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design for alterations to existing structures with frontages on both K Street and Wisconsin Avenue. Submit working drawings for permit review when ready.

O.G. 91-35	3323 P Street, N.W.	New garden wall
HPA. 91-194	Robert Moore/Mary Mottershead Residence	and alterations - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for porch infill, new wall and terrace, and garden entrance from P Street. Applicant has agreed to submit proposed fence and gates at rear of property under separate application.

O.G. 90-109	3041 N Street, N.W.	Rear addition
HPA. 90-494	J. Boisclair/L. Murphy Residence	- conceptual

ACTION: Returned without Action. Case withdrawn by written request of applicant.

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
O.G. 91-50	3139 M Street, N.W.	New window
HPA. 91-190	Philbert Properties	openings
(See O.G. 91-06)	Ole Glory restaurant	- permit

ACTION: Recommend AGAINST issuance of permit for proposed window openings as submitted. Recommend any exterior changes to this structure 1) complement in style and proportions the front of the building and 2) engage the party wall as a whole. There is no objection to concept of sidewall windows per se.

O.G. 91-36	3200 M Street, N.W.	Wall lanterns
HPA. 91-195	GAP Store Planning	- permit
(See O.G. 91-13)	Banana Republic	

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new brass lanterns.

O.G. 91-31	1201 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.	Parking signs
HPA. 91-187	Riggs National Bank	- permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed parking signs as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 6 February 1991.

O.G. 91-30	1101 30th Street, N.W.	Archway and
HPA. 91-152	CP Private Partnership	alterations -
(See O.G. 90-151)	Georgetown Inc.	revised concept
	Georgetown Court	

ACTION: No objection to concept design for alterations to entranceway and courtyard as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 31 January 1991.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS PRE-MEETING TOUR - 21 February 1991

CONVENE: 8:00 AM
Pension Building, Suite 312, 441 F Street, N.W.

1. 22nd and N Streets, N.W.
New residential building.
2. 2140 N Street, N.W.
Potomac Electric Power Company.
3. John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts
New Hampshire Avenue at Rock Creek Parkway.
4. International Cultural and Trade Center
Federal Triangle at 14th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue,
N.W.

Members Present:

J. Carter Brown, Chairman
Neil H. Porterfield, Vice Chairman
Joan Abrahamson
Adele Chatfield-Taylor
Robert Peck

Staff Present:

Donald B. Myer
Jose Martinez-Canino

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

21 February 1991

The meeting was convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at the Pension Building, 441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., after a tour of project sites.

Members present: Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman
 Hon. Neil H. Porterfield, Vice Chairman
 Hon. Joan Abrahamson
 Hon. Adele Chatfield-Taylor
 Hon. George E. Hartman
 Hon. Robert A. Peck

Staff present: Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
 Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary
 Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson
 Mrs. Sue Kohler
 Mr. Jose Martinez-Canino

National Capital
Planning Commission
staff present:

Mr. Patrick Tribe

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes of the 17 January 1991 meeting. The minutes were approved without objection.

B. Dates of next meetings. The dates of the next meetings were approved as:

18 April 1991

16 May 1991

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 21/FEB/91-1, International Cultural and Trade Center, Federal Triangle development site, 14th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Schematic design. (Previous: CFA 15/NOV/89-1) The Assistant Secretary introduced Jay Brodie, executive director of

PADC, who reviewed briefly the design issues that had been considered in this project--height, setbacks, parking, and compatibility with the Triangle buildings. He stressed the public nature of the project, in contrast to the wholly office function of the older buildings, and said three to five million visitors were expected annually. He said the development contract had been signed, noted that the cost of the project would be about \$656 million, and added that GSA had signed a thirty-year lease. Mr. Brodie said they were anxious to move ahead quickly, the site had been cleared, and he estimated it would take about two years to get up to ground level.

Mr. Brodie then introduced William Zeckendorf, Jr., the developer, who recalled the many times his father had worked with architect I. M. Pei. Mr. Zeckendorf praised the work of James Freed, of Pei Cobb Freed & Partners, architect for the ICTC, and he said that the quality of the architectural design was the most important factor in this project. He then introduced Mr. Freed to make the presentation.

Mr. Freed began by showing slides. He discussed the geometry of the area through the use of early and recent aerial views of the Triangle, and then showed slides of his design for the ICTC, discussing its development and urban design aspects for those members who had not been on the Commission when he made his presentation in 1989 and the project was given concept approval. He reviewed his decision to make the pedestrian entrance into the project from Pennsylvania Avenue come in at a right angle, rather than have it follow the orthogonal grid; he pointed out the rotunda-like element at this corner of the new building, which would serve as an entrance to the theatre and the ICTC, and then discussed the way the space beyond the pedestrian entrance widened out into a plaza at the hemicycle and Metro entrance, with the projection of an octagonal element to break up the long facade of the building, and how this space subsequently narrowed at the southern end of the project, continuing through the arched openings of the old Triangle out to Constitution Avenue. He noted that there was also a strong east-west axis through the project, from the hemicycle and Metro entrance through the large, multi-level, glass-roofed ICTC exhibition space to the 14th Street entrance. Mr. Freed said the first three floors of the project would be devoted to public use with government office space above; there would be underground parking for 2500 cars.

The architectural style of the building was then discussed. Mr. Freed said he did not want to produce a clone of the Federal Triangle, but he did want to respect the classicism of the earlier buildings. In searching for a way to organize the facades, he had noticed the Treasury building, where the windows were set between pilasters and the floor lines marked by horizontal mouldings, and he had used this as a point of departure for his facade designs. He showed a drawing, pointing out the rusticated base, articulated

entrance, and the window arrangement. Noting the importance of the 13th and 14th Street facades, he said they would have the most articulation and the others would be more simple, without the pilasters. He then showed drawings of the round corner element, or rotunda, on Pennsylvania Avenue, including sections through the theatre area; he said he considered the rotunda to be one of the most important architectural features, because its curve would lead people into the complex.

The members then looked at a large model, and Mr. Freed went through the major design features with them. He commented that public art would be a major feature of the project, as it was in the original Triangle. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor and Mr. Peck questioned Mr. Freed about the shape and function of the octagonal element in the plaza off Pennsylvania Avenue. He said it would house restaurant facilities, and he had placed it there to break up the long diagonal of the building wall and keep the space from leaking out. He said it needed to have the character of a garden pavilion but still had to be attached to the building and look like it belonged. Noting that the design of this element had received a lot of thought, he placed several versions of it on the model, some with a slanting glass roof and others more solid in appearance. Mr. Freed then pointed out other aspects of the design, including service entrances--a truck entrance off 14th Street and a garage entrance between the District Building and the section of the ICTC building to the east.

Landscape architect Peter Walker was then introduced. He said the landscaping for the project would be all of one piece, but he observed that the plaza/hemicycle area was the largest and strongest element and the landscaping here would be most critical. He reviewed the traditional way of landscaping classical buildings, with foundation plantings and street furniture to build up to the architecture, and trees, often clipped, used as an extension of the architecture. But he said there was another approach, the Italianate, in which the ground plane came right up to the building, with little or no formal planting, and a series of objects were set in the foreground space, not tied to the building, but set slightly in opposition to it. Trees enhanced the setting, but they were not used in an architectural way. He showed slides of European examples and said he would like to combine the two approaches at the ICTC site, playing one against the other. Mr. Walker then showed drawings of the pedestrian plaza off Pennsylvania Avenue. The area was divided down the middle, with grass and rows of plane trees in front of the former Post Office Department building and the Hemicycle area, and paving carried up to the edge of the ICTC building. In the space around the octagonal projection were groups of "sculptural" elements--low columns and stone seating blocks. This paved area would be used for various activities, in contrast to the neoclassical space on the other side which would have a more passive use; Mr. Walker stressed, however, that the entire surface would be flush,

including the transition to the grass area, so that people would walk back and forth freely. He said that in developing this landscape scheme he had tried to find a mid-point between a playful solution and a reverence for the neoclassical tradition.

The members were all concerned about the decision to divide the space right down the middle; they thought a sense of dominant and subordinate was needed. It was thought that the green area could be pushed further toward the former Post Office Department and the Hemicycle; Vice-Chairman Porterfield cautioned, however, that the trees should not be reduced to one row, that there should be a bosque where people could sit and look at the new building. At the same time, Ms. Chatfield-Taylor thought that care should be taken that the Hemicycle was not hidden by trees.

The Chairman suggested that perhaps too much was being attempted, that the architecture should be allowed to carry the day. He and the other members were also concerned about the placement of the rectangular, bench-like elements in the space around the octagonal projection; there was a feeling that they would block the movement through the space. Another concern was the way in which the octagonal element would join the building; the notch at the point of juncture seemed awkward. This was discussed with Mr. Freed, as was the "skirt" around this element, which bothered some of the members. Mr. Peck observed that the 90 degree entrance off Pennsylvania Avenue created some uncomfortable places in the open area; he agreed that there had to be some projecting form to break up the diagonal, but he thought it caused problems. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor agreed. The Chairman turned to Mr. Freed's facade design; he said he was concerned about the great height of the central bank of windows, how the floor levels would be articulated, and whether fluorescent ceiling fixtures would be visible. Mr. Freed explained how the windows would be detailed and the floor levels expressed behind the windows.

There were no further questions, and the Chairman said there was general approval of the organization of the facades, the use of pilasters, and the rusticated bases. He said the main concern was the octagonal pavilion and the landscaping design for the plaza. Mr. Freed said the discussion had been helpful, and he would restudy the elements questioned. Exhibit A

B. U. S. Navy Memorial Foundation

1. CFA 21/FEB/91-2, Bas-reliefs for Navy Memorial, Pennsylvania Avenue at 8th Street, N.W. (Last submission of ongoing review: CFA 13/DEC/90-8.) Staff member Sue Kohler introduced Captain Bob Jones from the Navy Memorial Foundation to show the members several new concepts and some final designs for this project. She noted also the presence of sculptor/coordinator Leo Irrera.

Captain Jones first showed a sketch for a new concept design for "Vietnam/Inland Operations". In the foreground was a scene on the deck of a swift boat, a type used in Vietnam. In the distance, there were other boats in the river and a suggestion of the river bank. The members found this concept much improved over the previous one, but thought that less of the deck should be shown, so that it did not appear that the action was taking place ashore; they also thought the scene could be simplified. As an alternate, they thought a good design could be based on a photograph Captain Jones showed of one of the boats; the Chairman did not think it necessary to have naval personnel in all the reliefs. The Vice-Chairman thought the photograph gave a better idea of the scale of the boats and the river.

The second concept, "Commodore Perry/Japan", was represented by a photograph of a clay sketch model. The sculptor, Leo Irrera, said it was based on a print showing Perry's arrival and his meeting with the Japanese. The members were pleased with the design, particularly with the Oriental character of the landscape, and it was approved for further development.

The third concept, "Marines/Amphibious Operations" was in sketch form and showed the Marines landing at Inchon, Korea. It was approved for further development.

Captain Jones then showed two designs the Commission had reviewed previously. The first was a photograph of a clay model for "Submarine Service"; the members were pleased with the clay version of the sketch they had seen and approved it for further development. The second photograph was of the final design model for "Naval Academy"; it was given final approval.

Lastly, Captain Jones said that when the "Destroyer Escorts" panel was cast, it was realized that the relief was too low when compared to the others already installed. He showed a new version that would solve this problem, and it was approved. Exhibit B

2. CFA 21/FEB/91-3, Inscriptions on bas-reliefs for Navy Memorial, Pennsylvania Avenue at 8th Street, N.W. Mrs. Kohler passed out the inscriptions that had been written to accompany the reliefs already installed at the memorial. Captain Jones said they would be on bronze plaques set above the reliefs; the plaques would be 2 by 12 inches, smaller than originally intended because the inscriptions had been shortened. The members were unanimous in thinking that only the titles of the reliefs should be used, that the memorial function should remain paramount; if more information were needed, it could be placed on a plaque somewhere, perhaps on the end-stones, or brochures could be made available to visitors. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor suggested that the plaques might look better if they extended the entire width of the stone; Mr. Hartman observed that the lettering size could then remain constant regardless of the length of the title. Exhibit B

C. Department of the Treasury, U. S. MintCFA 21/FEB/91-4, Laurance S. Rockefeller medal. Designs.

Mrs. Kohler passed out sketches of the obverse and reverse of this medal honoring conservationist Laurance Rockefeller. There was a profile portrait on the obverse and a depiction of the Grand Teton Mountains on the reverse, with inscriptions. She introduced Kevin Cullinane from the Mint, and he spoke briefly about Mr. Rockefeller's accomplishments. He said the design of the medal had been approved by Mr. Rockefeller and his family, and he noted that the representation of the Grand Teton Mountains had been taken from an Ansel Adams photograph, and that permission had been granted to use it.

There were no objections to the design as such, and it was approved, but there were questions about the lettering. It was not clear what style was intended, and Mr. Cullinane was asked to bring a drawing of the medal to the staff which showed the specific style proposed. The Chairman noted that, on the reverse, an awkward gap was created by the wide spacing between some of the words in the inscription, and Vice-Chairman Porterfield thought the size of the lettering should vary with the importance of the inscriptions. Mr. Cullinane was asked to work with the staff on these matters. Exhibit C

D. John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

CFA 21/FEB/91-5, New Hampshire Avenue at Rock Creek Parkway. Modifications to gift shop and coatroom in the Hall of States. Staff member Jose Martinez explained the project briefly and introduced Mr. James Stokoe, architect, from Stokoe/Callison to make the presentation. Before Mr. Stokoe began, the Chairman said he would like to state that he was a trustee, ex-officio, of the Kennedy Center because of his chairmanship of the Commission of Fine Arts, and he would be happy to recuse himself if the other members so wished. The members did not think his recusal was necessary, under these circumstances, and especially since the Kennedy Center was bringing this matter of interior design to the Commission for guidance only.

Mr. Stokoe said the modifications represented a long overdue solution to the problem of providing adequate facilities for the gift shop, coat room, box office queues, and service desk in the Great Hall. He observed that the long walls and great height (63 feet) of the hall did not lend themselves well to this kind of thing, so he had tried to key the structures into the architecture. He showed a model and drawings of four canopy structures, 15-feet high, with columns set 10 feet apart, which he thought would make the existing openings in the walls less disruptive. He had chosen a wavy form for the canopies and set the columns at an angle to give a festive appearance and recall a style popular when the Kennedy Center was built. In answer to Mr. Peck's question, he

said the canopies would probably be reinforced fiberglass, but the colors had not been chosen yet.

It was agreed by all that the structure should be kept as light and thin as possible, and the Vice-Chairman suggested that the canopy columns should not replicate the gold color of the architectural columns in the hall. Mr. Hartman thought Mr. Stokoe should investigate further the use of fabric for the canopies, and he expressed some concern about the use of box-like elements to define the various spaces; he made some suggestions that might improve their appearance. The Chairman said he agreed that organization of the existing clutter was desirable, but he thought this should be the end of additions to the Hall of States. It was stressed that the detailing, color, and material choice would be critical to the success of the design. As this was an informal submission, no action was necessary. Exhibit D

E. Government of the District of Columbia, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 91-59, 6200 Oregon Avenue, N.W. Addition of new facilities, Army Distaff Foundation. Concept design. Mr. Carson located the site, overlooking Rock Creek Park on the west side. He said there was an existing 1960's facility on the site, as well as an early 20th century house, Knollwood. He introduced Alan Resnick from Sasaki Associates to describe the proposed addition.

Mr. Resnick said the new facility would provide for old people who were well but needed a limited degree of care. He showed renderings, pointing out that the new construction would wrap around the 1960's building at the corner, so as not to disturb the surrounding residential area or the topography any more than necessary; in architectural style, it would relate to the old house on the property. It would be a pinkish brick, similar to the existing facility, although Mr. Resnick said the exact color had not been chosen yet.

The Chairman asked if there was a staff opinion; Mr. Carson said the staff's main concern was the landscaping, that it be adequate to screen the construction from the park. Vice-Chairman Porterfield thought the facility would become more visible with the addition of the new construction; Mr. Resnick said they would save as many trees as possible. Mr. Hartman said he would prefer that there be no change in color horizontally, as was shown on the rendering, because that would negate the beneficial effect of the vertical elements in the addition. He also thought the cooling tower and elevator lobby connection needed more study. It was suggested that the staff do further checking on the visibility, and

Mr. Resnick was asked to come back with a topographical map, tree locations, a landscape plan, and sight-line studies. Exhibit E

(The meeting was adjourned for lunch at 1 p.m. and reconvened at 1:45. The agenda order was changed and the Korean War Memorial discussed next.)

F. American Battle Monuments Commission

CFA 21/FEB/91-6, Korean War Veterans Memorial, between the Reflecting Pool and Independence Avenue, S.W., Ash Woods near Lincoln Memorial. Revised concept design. (Previous: CFA 17/JAN/91-2, CFA 13/DEC/90-1, CFA 26/JUL/89-1.) The Assistant Secretary introduced General Stilwell to begin the presentation. General Stilwell said the design had been revised so that it met the Commission's requirements and still kept the thirty-eight soldiers and the scope of memorialization mandated by Congress. He said they needed to move ahead before the time allowed by the legislation expired and the interest in making contributions waned. He introduced architect Kent Cooper to discuss his revised design.

Mr. Cooper showed slides of his two designs, making comparisons and pointing out that the new version was smaller and simpler. Following Commission recommendations, he had abandoned the idea of landscaping the area to resemble Constitution Gardens, and had developed a pedestrian circulation system tied into the existing road. The memorial retained its diagonal axis, towards the south, specifically the Jefferson Memorial. The thirty-eight figures had been moved together with paths on either side, rather than being divided by a path down the middle. They marched up a gentle slope (5 feet) to a paved flag plaza, ringed by a grove of trees. There would be a memorial feature in front of the flag, its nature not yet determined, and a still pool. Radial paths linked the plaza to the outlying path system.

Flanking the soldiers to the south was a new element--an earth-toned polished granite wall, on which there would be visual representations of support personnel. Mr. Cooper showed drawings of an idea for this representation that had been worked out by artist Louis Nelson. There were large faces of veterans, with a focus on the eyes, the faces done in a dot technique that dissolved into an abstraction when viewed close-up. He showed an example done on a piece of polished granite. He added that the reflections in the granite--of the line of soldiers and the trees on the site--would be an important part of the total effect.

Mr. Cooper then talked about the sculpture. He said the figures had been pushed together and the paths put on the outside rather than down the middle. This would eliminate the problem of visitors having to look from side to side and would facilitate the movement of people along the line. He said Mr. Gaylord's sculpture would remain impressionistic, and he showed slides of three ethnic

studies. He noted also that the figures had been reduced in height from 8 to 7 feet, and the line from 210 to 180 feet. He said he would be working with both Mr. Gaylord and Mr. Nelson to put together a proposal.

The members had some questions for Mr. Cooper and a discussion followed. Mr. Peck asked if the axis of the line of figures had changed. Mr. Cooper said the path of soldiers was still on the Lincoln/Jefferson axis, but the visitor would enter on a slightly different axis; some adjustments had been made to miss existing trees. In answer to questions from Mr. Hartman, he said the flag plaza had been lowered about 2 feet, and there was no longer a railing around it; the line of soldiers would rise about 5 feet above normal grade, and the wall would be ten feet high at its highest point. Mr. Peck said he did not feel that there was any real rationale for the axis, although it did get the memorial away from the road. He asked if there had been any change in the figures; Mr. Cooper said there was less movement now, and although the tension would remain, there would be no depiction of a soldier being hit by enemy fire. Mr. Peck said he was happy to hear that had been eliminated. He said he had some concern about the use of a wall, because of the Vietnam Memorial, and about the lack of representation of a woman in the line of soldiers. On the whole, however, he thought the design had improved.

The Chairman commented that in this design so much would rest on the experience of the visitor as he saw the figures. He recalled that when the original design was submitted, the Commission had been surprised at the number of figures proposed. He said it had a certain appeal, as a change for the 90s, but he observed that there had been an elegaic quality to the group, a recall of the photos of soldiers trudging through the Korean landscape. He thought that if the figures became too realistic, the visitor's own experience would not come into play and the effect would be weakened; he said it was very hard for the Commission to make a decision on this matter until all the usual visual evidence was in. Chairman Brown said he did like the wall, although he had not expected he would; he thought it provided a good way to honor the support troops, helped with the containment problem, and because of its earth-tone color, would not recall the wall at the Vietnam Memorial. He thought the dot concept for rendering the faces was an interesting one, and would make the memorial classical and modern at the same time, but he thought that the combination of both two and three-dimensional representation--the soldiers and the images on the wall--would be hard to bring off. He thought the geometry was much improved. He said that while he saw a lot of potential in the new scheme, he did not think the Commission was ready to make a decision yet. Mr. Cooper agreed that he did not have all the answers yet on the wall or the figures.

Ms. Chatfield-Taylor's comments centered on these two elements. She questioned making both the wall and the figures representational, and she did not like the juxtaposition of the Lichtenstein-like images on the wall with the realism of the soldiers. She was also concerned about the color combination of the earth-toned wall with the cold white bronze or aluminum of the sculpture.

Mr. Hartman said he found the revised design much more unified. He thought the figures had been strengthened by being brought together with the paths on either side, and he liked the concept of the wall and the reflections. He thought, however, that the details had to be mocked-up.

Ms. Abrahamson said she was troubled by the wall and its juxtaposition with the figures--which should she look at first? Mr. Cooper said the visitor would go from one to the other and noted that the wall images would be blurred from close-up and would best be seen from a distance. Ms. Abrahamson said she found this confusing. She thought the wall and the figures would compete with each other, and the effect would be worsened when a large number of visitors were added to the space. She said she was still not convinced that the figures were the right thing for this memorial; she asked if thirty-eight statues really said anything about war and sacrifice, and she emphasized that the site was a very special one and deserved very special consideration.

The Chairman said he shared Ms. Abrahamson's concerns, and he asked Mr. Cooper if it was really necessary for the visitors to walk between the soldiers and the wall. Mr. Cooper replied that he was afraid that if he removed the path the wall would become just a backdrop, and its commemorative function weakened. Chairman Brown then questioned Mr. Cooper about the triangular-shaped lawn area on the other side of the soldiers; he thought another kind of plant material--something rougher--would look better.

Mr. Peck stressed that the Commission must review all the images proposed. He said he would never again vote for something because it was politically popular, and he thought it was time to get back to the idea of having a part stand for the whole as far as the design of memorials was concerned.

There were no further comments and the Chairman asked for a motion. Mr. Hartman moved that since the Commission had approved the original concept design, and since so much had been accomplished in improving the revised design, the Commission approve the approach and ask the architect to come back with the individual elements. Mr. Peck seconded the motion and it was carried, with Ms. Abrahamson dissenting, and Ms. Chatfield-Taylor stating that she had voted for it with the reservations she had previously expressed.

Mr. Peck asked Park Service representative John Parsons when the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation and the State Historic Preservation Officer would get involved in this; he said he thought it would have been earlier. Mr. Parsons said it was scheduled for the March meeting of the State Historic Preservation Commission, after the design had been reviewed by NCPC early in the month.

Mr. Cooper said he would appreciate any words of wisdom the Commission, collectively or individually, might be able to give him as he worked to develop the design. Mr. Hartman said that at this time he had one comment, that it must be remembered that the memorial was to be a work of art, not a museum.

The Chairman at this time noted that Vice-Chairman Porterfield had again recused himself from discussing and voting on this project, because of his academic association with the designers of the original memorial scheme, who were professors in the Department of Landscape Architecture at Penn State University, which he chaired.

The Secretary asked to announce that he had received a resolution from the Korean War Veterans Association urging that the design problems be resolved quickly so that fund raising and construction could begin. Exhibit F

G. Executive Office of the President

CFA 21/FEB/91-7, American Battle Monuments Commission draft bill, "To amend the Act entitled, 'An Act to authorize the erection of a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor members of the Armed Forces of the United States who served in the Korean War.'" The Secretary said the purpose of this legislation was to remove the five year stricture on fund raising for the memorial, noting that the present legislation required that construction begin in October 1991. He said there were several other memorials facing the same problem, and that consideration was being given to changing the time period from five to seven years in future legislation. The Chairman said he hoped there would be no objection to the bill; the members all agreed that it would be helpful in providing extra time to ensure the best design, and it was unanimously approved. (The Commission then returned to the remaining Shipstead-Luce submissions on the agenda.)

E.1.b. S.L. 91-66, 22nd and N Streets, N.W. New residential building. Revised concept. (Previous: S.L. 89-236, S.L. 89-188.) Mr. Martinez said the Commission had previously approved a design for this building that was 90 feet high; because of community concern, the developers had hired a new architect and were presenting a new design. He introduced David Fitch, representing the developer, who told the members that the new design had

received approval from the Zoning Commission, Planning Commission, and partial approval from the Historic Preservation Review Board. He introduced the architect, David Habib, who showed drawings of the new building and pointed out the old "Wardman" apartment building on the site which, having recently been declared a landmark, would be incorporated in the new construction.

Mr. Habib said the new design was lower than the one previously seen by the Commission: instead of 90 feet, it was 72 feet high to the parapet. But the parapet had recently been revised to provide a more interesting silhouette at the top, making it 4 feet high, 2 feet higher than the Zoning Commission had suggested. He said this had brought objections from some people in the community, but he noted that if the parapet were reduced 2 feet, it would have to have a railing, for safety purposes, bringing the actual height up again to 4 feet.

The Chairman asked if there were anyone from the community who would like to comment. Pamela Taylor, representing the West End Action Coalition, said they had worked closely with the developer on the new design and were pleased with it, although they did object to the extra parapet height. The Chairman said the Commission did not want to get involved in a matter that was properly within the jurisdiction of the Zoning Commission, but he thought the building was as sensitive to the community as it could be, given its size. The other members agreed, and the design was given concept approval. Exhibit E

c. S.L. 91-68, 2140 N Street, N.W., Potomac Electric Power Company. Alterations to facade on N Street. Permit. Mr. Carson said this submission was for resurfacing and renovation of an existing substation, giving it a Victorian facade and adding landscaping. The design of bay windows and other architectural elements had been taken from buildings in the neighborhood. He introduced the architect, Duane Jonlin, from Bryant & Bryant, who showed drawings of the proposed work. He said there had been a long history of neighborhood complaints about the appearance of the building, and PEPCO had agreed to do something to make it more acceptable.

The Chairman said the members had seen the building on their pre-meeting tour, and they were unanimous in saying that the renovations would destroy the integrity of the modest, not unattractive industrial building; he said the Commission would be the laughing-stock of the design community if it approved giving it a false residential front, especially when the sides of the building, which were visible, were left untouched. The members did agree that it could benefit from landscaping along the sidewalk and that the windows and door needed some restoration and repair. The architect showed a second scheme with less radical change, but the Commission did not find it acceptable, either.

The Chairman asked if there were any comments from the community. Ms. Gimlin, who had been behind the effort to get PEPCO to make the substation more compatible with the neighborhood, said she could not understand how the Commission could find the building attractive. She said the proximity of the substation had lowered real estate values in a neighborhood where many people had restored Victorian houses; she added that the old industrial uses, present when the substation was built, had vanished. She read a statement that set forth the neighborhood's position.

Ms. Chatfield-Taylor said she thought it was admirable that PEPCO had been so sensitive to the community's wishes, and she was sure that the money that was intended to be used on this project could be used elsewhere in the neighborhood so that the good will that had been established would be maintained. She added that she was in complete agreement with the Chairman's comments about the architecture of the substation.

There was further discussion with the representatives of the community and with the architect about what the Commission would allow in the way of change. The Chairman said the Commission would look at other proposals if they wished to bring them in, but when asked for suggestions, he said the members had already suggested that they confine themselves to implementing a landscaping plan, such as the one shown on the drawings. He noted that PEPCO had said they would hire a landscaping firm to install and maintain the plantings. The architect was asked to bring in a detailed landscape plan for the Commission to review. Exhibit E

d. Appendix I. The Appendix was approved without objection.

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. Appendix II. The Appendix was approved without objection.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Signed,



Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202 504 2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT A

5 March 1991

Mrk
Dear Mr. Hauser,

The Commission was delighted to review the design development of the International Cultural and Trade Center with Messrs. Zeckendorf, Freed, Walker, and Brody on 21 February 1991. We were encouraged by the progress since our previous review in November of 1989 and give our approval to the basic development of the architectural concept at this stage.

The proposed landscaping, however, needs further study. The major area of concern is the open space separating the new center from the former Post Office department on the east. This is an especially complex space with very powerful elements such as the existing hemi-cycle competing with various entrances that reflect specific functions in the new center. It is further compounded by the axis of the space that is 90° to the axis of Pennsylvania Avenue. As you know this sets up a certain tension with the existing building which happens to be oriented on the orthogonal grid system. This is an exciting feature, but as such the level of excitement can be taken only so far before working at cross purposes with the original intentions of the design. The Commission feels that whatever landscaping elements are introduced into this space should be on the quiet side and not raise the level of intensity and complexity any further, or risk bisecting the space.

We look forward to the continuing development of both the architecture and landscape design. We also look to the development of more precise ideas on the incorporation of sculpture, murals, and other such works which will in the final analysis comprise a very

Mr. Richard Hauser
Page Two

important role in determining the level of excellence that is appropriate to such a monumental building in the Federal Triangle.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'JCB' or similar initials, written in a cursive style.

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Richard Hauser, Chairman
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation
Suite 1220 North
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-1703

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N W, SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT B

5 March 1991

Dear Captain Jones,

The Commission of Fine Arts was pleased to meet with you and sculptor/coordinator Leo Irrera during its 21 February meeting to review further designs for bas-reliefs at the Navy Memorial.

The following comments were made:

Vietnam/Inland Operations: The composition was considered much improved, but if retained, it was suggested that the amount of deck area shown be reduced so that it does not appear that the action is taking place ashore; also, it was recommended that the deck scene be simplified and fewer elements included. As an alternative, the members thought a good design could be based on the photograph shown of one of the swift boats in the river. It would give a better idea of scale, bring out the narrow, confining aspect of the river, provide an opportunity to depict the character of the river bank, and introduce a different kind of ship to provide variety and instruction in the series as a whole.

Commodore Perry/Japan, Marines/Amphibious Operations, and Submarine Operations were approved for further development.

Naval Academy was given final approval, as was the design for a new casting of Destroyer Escorts, revised to allow for higher relief.

The inscriptions proposed to be placed above the reliefs, on bronze plaques, were considered too long, and it was recommended that just the titles be used. It was also thought that the plaques would look better if they were longer, perhaps even as much as the width of the reliefs; in that way, the lettering size could remain constant in spite of the varying lengths of the

Captain Robert S. Jones
Page Two

titles. The members stressed the importance of choosing the right lettering style and asked to see examples before the work was begun.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "J. Carter Brown", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Robert S. Jones
Captain, U.S. Navy (Ret.)
United States Navy Memorial Foundation
Box 12728
Arlington, VA 22209-8728

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

PENSION BUILDING
401 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT C

5 March 1991

Dear Mrs. Pope:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed designs for a medal honoring Laurance Rockefeller at its 21 February meeting.

The designs were approved with the exception of the lettering. It was not clear from the drawings what style was intended, and the members asked that the staff see a drawing using a specific lettering style. Additionally, it was pointed out that, on the reverse, the wide spacing between the words, "champion" and "of," and "and" and "human," resulted in an awkward gap that should be eliminated.

Another problem noted, particularly on the reverse, was that the two inscriptions carried nearly equal weight because the letters did not vary sufficiently in size; it would seem that the size of "Act of Congress 1900" should be noticeably smaller than "Champion of Natural and Human Rights."

A final comment was that by making the portrait on the obverse slightly smaller, there would be more breathing room, and the lettering would not have to come quite so close to the edge.

The staff would be happy to look at these modifications when they are ready.

Sincerely,



J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable Donna Pope, Director
United States Mint
633 Third Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20220

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT D

5 March 1991

Dear Ms. Otremba,

During its meeting of 21 February 1991, the Commission was pleased to consider a proposed alteration to the Hall of States at Kennedy Center. A visit to the Center prior to the meeting provided the members with a first-hand impression of the problems involved. As such, the concept design shown is a welcome alternative to current conditions in the hall and a reasonable accommodation of the anticipated expansion of services.

As it exists, the hall appears too large and disproportionately high. The attenuated columns exaggerate the illusion, rising to a featureless ceiling that fails to provide the focus one would expect in such a space. This would appear to require a resolution that will focus attention at a more manageable level. The proposed rippled canopies may provide that answer.

As a concept, the canopies are intended to break the vertical line of the columns while creating points of focus which also happen to define the physical boundaries of the various intended services. The services are further defined by a judicious selection of display boxes, counters, and screens, simple objects used as furniture to help map out the territory of these small spaces within the larger confines of the hall itself.

The success of the proposal will rely on the choice of material and color, the detailing and workmanship, and the careful relation between the canopies and their display boxes, counters, and

Ms. Geraldine M. Otremba
Page Two

screens. The result should be sophisticated and uncluttered, without appearing to be an intrusion.

Please let us know if the Commission can be of further assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "J. Carter Brown". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "J" and a stylized "C".

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Ms. Geraldine M. Otremba
Director of Operations
The Kennedy Center
Washington, D.C. 20566-0001

AGENDA ITEM EXHIBITS

21 February 1991

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
S.L. 91-59	6200 Oregon Avenue, N.W. Army Distaff Foundation Institution	Addition to care facility - conceptual
ACTION: No objection to concept of proposed addition. Recommend permit submission include detailed existing topographical survey with location of all trees of 12-inch caliper or greater and showing proposed topographical changes and trees to be removed. In addition, provide proposed landscape plan and schedule with emphasis on screening from Oregon and Nebraska Avenues. Final submission should include material samples chosen to complement site and existing stone residence.		
S.L. 91-66	2225 N Street, N.W. IBG Development Westbrooke Place	New residential building - concept
ACTION: No objection to conceptual design for new residential building and alterations to existing structure. Submit working drawings, including detailed landscape plan, for permit review when ready. Erect on-site material sample panel for approval prior to construction.		
S.L. 91-68	2140 N Street, N.W. Potomac Electric Power Co. Electrical substation	Facade alteration and landscaping - permit
ACTION: Returned. Request submission of landscape plan. In discussion with the Commission, applicant has agreed to limit new application to landscaping.		

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT F

5 March 1991

Dear Colonel Badger,

I am writing to confirm the Commission's action on the revised design for the Korean War Veterans Memorial which we reviewed at our meeting on 21 February 1991.

As you know the Commission was very encouraged with Cooper/Lecky's changes to the overall configuration of the memorial. Foremost, of course, is the much tighter organization of the major design elements. It now reads as a single composition rather than a series of events more loosely strung together and is much stronger as a result. It is also smaller which is again another plus. The impact on the park as viewed from both Independence Avenue and from the north near the reflecting pool is far less than any of the previous plans. The architectural design, as it now stands, is conceptually approved, pending acceptable resolution of the figurative elements.

The Commission is still deeply concerned with the sculptural and graphic features of the memorial. Their sheer magnitude is a problem in itself. It borders so closely on overstatement that unless extreme care is exercised in rendering the figures, the goal of achieving an effect of great dignity and power risks being missed. This risk is further compounded with the juxtaposition of the sculpture and the graphic images on the adjoining wall.

There is no way, given the incompleteness of the visual development so far, to be able to predict how it will turn out. At the same time, the Commission, despite its concern, feels the idea has promise and should not be dismissed simply because there are uncertainties. At this point, all we can say is that the approach has a qualified approval, with final

Colonel Frederick C. Badger
Page Two

confirmation depending on more detailed studies
including actual mock-ups or models of the sculpture
and graphic elements combined.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "J. Carter Brown". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letters of the first and last names being capitalized and prominent.

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Colonel Frederick C. Badger
American Battle Monuments Commission
5127 Pulaski Building
20 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20314

